



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

own religion we shall be taking the first step toward that mutual understanding which will free the eternal message of him who is for us God's final word to his own countrymen as to all mankind, from those associations of narrowness and intolerance which have robbed it of its rightful hearing.

WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
NEW YORK CITY

THE CHRISTOLOGICAL PROBLEM

Professor Sanday's recent stimulating volume on Christology¹ falls naturally—but not formally—into two parts. The first consists of two lectures on ancient christology and the second on six lectures dealing with modern christologies, including that of author's, and concluding with a lecture on symbolism in which Professor Sanday presents a method of using the creeds without committing one's self to individual detailed belief therein.

The two lectures on ancient christologies are marked by Professor Sanday's characteristic judicial treatment, tolerance, delightfully liberal spirit, and engaging honesty. In them he points out the main line of christological development in the ecumenical church. His starting-point is what he calls "the net result of the Apostolic Age, namely, that the church at large thought of its founder as divine" (p. 6). Such a statement on its face is undeniable, but it by no means represents the entire situation, and so formulated is likely to lead the investigator to overlook the vital matter that another net result of the Apostolic Age was the belief that Jesus was the Jewish Messiah who was to return to establish his kingdom from heaven whither he had gone. If there is anything which appears in the New Testament or the early Fathers it is this messianic valuation of Jesus. Of course it is true that they regarded him as possessed of the Holy Spirit and in that sense divine. It is also true that he could be spoken of as God by an enthusiast like Ignatius. But the christology which the New Testament bequeathed the second century was essentially messianic, functional, and official, rather than ontological; Christ was the savior and his kingdom, into which men were to be saved through assimilating—to use Clement's

¹ "*Christologies Ancient and Modern.*" By William Sanday, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D. Lady Margaret Professor and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1910. vii+244 pages. \$1.75.

word—God and through resurrection, was universally regarded as eschatological.

The real problem which the second century faced, as appears from many indications, was threefold: first, the recasting of messiahship in terms of the Logos; second, further knowledge as regards the part of God in this divine salvation which the Christians expected; and third, the exploration of the philosophical significance of the three great elements of the Rule of Faith, Monotheism, the messiahship of Jesus, and the certainty of coming judgment and deliverance. The radical expression of this threefold tendency is found in Justin Martyr, Clement, and Origen, while the equally radical hostility to this "seeking after truth" is to be seen in Tertullian.

Professor Sanday seems to have adopted the usual course of considering the early church as building up its christology exclusively from a speculative interest. This was not true even in the case of gnosticism. The real interest in the messianic conception was lost in the relation of the Logos (identified with the messianic savior) on the one side to God and on the other side to man. And this was by no means exclusively speculative. Socialized conceptions, almost entirely overlooked in Professor Sanday's treatment, are practical as well. A historical valuation is often approached by Professor Sanday but usually in the way of an appeal to make an allowance for philosophical and scientific limitations of the past. A more thoroughly historical treatment would have emphasized the value of the various concepts and definitions as a means of adjusting the old soteriological messianic faith to a world to which messiahship had both to be brought literally and evaluated metaphysically. Professor Sanday has clearly stated the main party divisions in the controversies, but he seems to have missed the real motives which lay back of the Arian struggle. Fundamentally his position is an apologetic for the Nicean formula and his two lectures are full of pregnant comment looking toward a "loose construction" of ecclesiastical tests and orthodoxy.

The significance of the book lies in its treatment of modern christology. Professor Sanday here gives a sympathetic treatment of various christological tendencies of today, especially among the Ritschlians with whom he disagrees and yet from whom he confesses to have received much help. Without being a compromising mediator he would not stop with the minimum which he is glad to confess the Ritschlian group has made fast in christology, but moves on toward the more explicitly credal position. In so doing, however, he protests against the

too rigorous division of the natures in the person of the historical Jesus, and at this point he makes an ingenious, if not altogether novel, use of the idea of the subliminal self. He cannot agree with what in many quarters now passes for orthodoxy, namely, that the humanity of Jesus was impersonal, and that personality was given him by the Logos. He would apparently hold that the person of Jesus was the apex of a great pyramid, much of which lay in the unconscious self where God and man could be really interpenetrative. Just how the Logos would become thus indented with the human self-consciousness sufficient to produce a person possessed of both divine and human natures as set forth by the later ecumenical creeds Professor Sanday does not discuss in detail. He certainly does not base his view upon the Virgin birth, which is not even mentioned in the "Index." If the subliminal consciousness is, as he says, "The proper seat or *locus* of the Incarnate Christ," in such a statement it would seem as if he had gone as far as he plans to go in the matter of the union of the natures for he passes at once to the conception of the consciousness of Jesus. This he declares to be messianic, and goes on to state (p. 179) what might well have been his original point of departure, that this messianic consciousness is one of office and character, rather than ontological.

In other words, Professor Sanday has followed the main drift of modern christological thought in centering attention upon the person of the historical Jesus with its unity of self-consciousness and has argued therefrom that God had been built into this person through the subliminal self. In this he is more of a Ritchlian than perhaps he thinks, for the metaphysical elements of his thought are submerged in the psychological. And this is what gives the book value as a mediating study. It indicates that the tendency of modern christology is psychological and pragmatic, rather than metaphysical. Had Professor Sanday devoted as much attention to the social psychology of ancient christologies as he has to the debatable psychology of the unconscious, he would have discovered in the process by which they were developed no inconsiderable amount of material for the support of his own position.

SHAILER MATHEWS

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO